REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-23, 29-31, 33-44, 46, 50, and 52-60 are pending. Claims 10, 17, 24-28, 32, 45, 47-49, 51 have previously been cancelled.

Claim 55 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 54 from which it previously depended.

Claim 58 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 1 from which it previously depended.

Support for new claim 60 can be found throughout the current specification. See, e.g., Example 3.

No new matter has been added.

Rejection of Claims 1-16, 18-23, 29-31, 33-44, 46, 50, 52-54--35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-16, 18-23, 29-31, 33-44, 46, 50, and 52-54 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO 97/24447 to Song et al. (Song) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,783,567 to Hedley et al. (Hedley) and E. Fattal et al., *Journal of Controlled Release*, 53 (1998) 137-143 (Fattal).

Rejection of Claim 54

Claim 54 is directed to a method of transfecting dendritic cells. The method comprises incubating dendritic cells and a transfection agent that comprises a polynucleotide (which encodes an antigen associated with a virus, a bacterium, a parasite, a fungus or a tumor) adsorbed on surfaces of microparticles. The incubation is performed *ex vivo* for a time sufficient to transfect the dendritic cells with the polynucleotide, thereby leading to the expression of said antigen.

For a proper obviousness rejection, the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art must be such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. 35 U.S.C. §103. The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. MPEP 2141. " '[R]ejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory

statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.' " *KSR International Co.* v. *Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), quoting *In re Kahn* , 441 F.3d 977, 988, (Fed. Cir. 2006). In addition, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. See MPEP 2143.02.

Song describes compositions and methods useful for stimulating an immune response against one or more disease associated antigens by genetically modifying dendritic cells *in vivo* or *ex vivo*. See Song Abstract. Gene delivery vehicles are described, which are targeted to dendritic cells, whether *in vivo* or *in vitro*, and which comprise a dendritic cell targeting element and an expression vector which directs expression of at least one disease associated antigen. *Id.* at page 2, lines 16-19. The dendritic cell targeting element can be any molecule which targets the gene delivery vehicle to a dendritic cell, for example, a high affinity binding pair, an antibody reactive against a dendritic cell surface marker, an antigen binding domain derived from an antibody reactive against a dendritic cell surface marker, or a hybrid envelope protein. *Id.* at page 3, lines 16-31.

In some embodiments, the expression vector is carried by a recombinant virus, including DNA and RNA viruses, preferably a recombinant virus derived from either a negative strand RNA virus or a positive strand RNA virus. *Id.* at page 2, lines 19-22. Various negative and positive strand viruses are set forth, for example, at page 2, line 22 to page 3, line 2.

In other embodiments, the gene delivery vehicle is non-viral gene delivery vehicle. *Id.* at page 3, lines 5-7. In some of these embodiments, the expression vector is complexed with one or more polynucleotide condensing agents, including polycations. *Id.* at page 3, lines 8-10. In some of these embodiment, the expression vector is associated with lipids, preferably encapsulated in liposomes. *Id.* at page 3, lines 13-15. In other embodiments, the expression vector is complexed only with the dendritic cell targeting element. *Id.* at page 3, lines 12-13.

Thus, Song teaches that the gene delivery vehicle may be viral or non-viral, and that dendritic cells may be genetically modified *in vivo* or *ex vivo*. Song, however, clearly expresses a preference for *in vivo* (direct injection) delivery of recombinant retroviruses carrying an expression vector. *Id.* at page 27, lines 25-27. Furthermore, the non-viral vehicles taught by Song (i.e., polynucleotides associated with condensing agents, encapsulated in liposomes, or complexed with dendritic cell targeting elements) are unrelated to the delivery vehicle of claim

54 (i.e., polynucleotides adsorbed on surfaces of microparticles), other than in the sense that they are "non-viral" techniques.

The Examiner has noted that claim 54 as written does not place any limitations on the nature of the polynucleotide and thus reads on a retroviral polynucleotide. Applicant's point, however, is not that the polynucleotide of claim 54 excludes a retroviral polynucleotide, but rather that the polynucleotide of claim 54 is adsorbed on the surfaces of microparticles for gene delivery, that microparticle gene delivery vehicles are non-viral in nature, and that microparticle gene delivery vehicles are not taught or suggested by Song.

Recognizing that Song is deficient, the Examiner argues that Hedley supplements Song through its teachings regarding the use of microspheres comprising biodegradable polymers and its use of DNA plasmids to introduce and express antigens encoded by the plasmids in antigen presenting cells such as macrophages and dendritic cells, both *in vitro* and *in vivo*, for the purpose of stimulating antigen specific immune responses. See the Office Action mailed May 5, 2009, page 6. It is further argued that Hedley provides motivation for introducing plasmid DNA encoding an antigen to antigen presenting cells such as macrophages and dendritic cells using biodegradable microspheres by teaching that DNA combined with biodegradable microparticles is efficiently phagocytosed by antigen presenting cells and is an effective means for introducing nucleic acids into these cells. *Id.* The Examiner further argues that Hedley recognizes that dendritic cells are a "legitimate target" for microparticle transfection when stating that the point of introduction of plasmid/microparticles to skin is the transfection of dendritic cells. *Id.*

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. The Examiner's view of Hedley, however, has been unduly influenced by hindsight that has been gleaned from Applicant's disclosure.

In particular, Hedley is said to be based on the discovery that microparticles containing nucleic acids and having an appropriate size for phagocytosis can be made without adversely affecting nucleic acid integrity. Hedley at col. 1, lines 32-37. Hedley states that phagocytosis of microparticles by macrophages and other antigen presenting cells (APCs) is an effective means for introducing the nucleic acid into these cells. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 13-15. Hedley teaches various means of *in vivo* delivery. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 20-34.

The microparticle-based technique of Hedley, therefore, has certain things in common with the teachings of Song. For example, Hedley describes non-viral gene delivery, while Song teaches the use of any gene delivery vehicle, whether viral or non-viral. Moreover, Hedley's composition is administered *in vivo*, whereas Song teaches the use of any mode of administration, whether *in vivo* or *ex vivo*.

However, Hedley is directed to particle-based non-viral gene delivery, whereas Song's non-viral gene delivery techniques are not particle-based (i.e., expression vector complexed with one or more polynucleotide condensing agents, including polycations; expression vector associated with lipids, preferably encapsulated in liposomes; expression vector complexed with dendritic cell targeting elements).

Moreover, the Examiner's argument that Hedley supplements Song through its teachings regarding the use of microparticles to introduce and express antigens in *dendritic* cells *in vitro* is clearly the result of undue hindsight.

In particular, as pointed out by the Examiner, Hedley does speculate at col. 8, lines 25-27 that, during intradermal delivery, microparticles could be *introduced to* antigen presenting cells of the skin, including dendritic cells and Langerhans cells (presumably because they are inherently present in the skin). This, however, is the only mention of dendritic cells in all of Hedley. Moreover, unlike the claimed method, this single mention of dendritic cells is in conjunction with an *in vivo* technique.

Elsewhere, Hedley refers to "macrophages and other antigen presenting cells (APCs)." See col. 8, lines 13-14. Indeed, the entire disclosure of Hedley is based upon the introduction of nucleic acids into macrophages, with the Examples describing the phagocytosis of DNA-containing polymeric microparticles by macrophages and the subsequent expression of that DNA.

One of ordinary skill in the art would read Hedley as taking advantage of macrophages' superior ability to phagocytose various materials (e.g., cells, cellular debris, etc.) in the body. One of ordinary skill in the art could not reasonably expect, however, based on the macrophage-based data of Hedley, that dendritic cells would also take up the microparticles (and thus the associated nucleic acids) and express the DNA therein.

For example, one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately recognize that particulate uptake by macrophages, which are aggressively phagocytic, would not be predictive of

particulate uptake by dendritic cells, which are not. In this regard, Applicant had previously attached M.F. Lipscomb et al., *Physiol Rev* 82:97-130, 2002 (Lipscomb), where it is noted that macrophages can be separated from dendritic cells using an "early method" based on the fact that macrophages are "avidly phagocytic" and thus readily phagocytose silica particles, latex beads, or carbonyl iron particles, while dendritic cells do not. See page 98, col. 2.

Applicant had also attached E. Karhumaki et al., *Clin. Exp. Immunol.* 1993; 91: 482-488 (Karhumaki), which describes a rapid and simple technique for purifying dendritic cells from human peripheral blood. In this technique, cells were incubated with carbonyl iron particles. Subsequently, the cells that had phagocytosed the iron were removed by a magnet. This step rendered the cell mixture essentially free of macrophages. The remaining cells that did not phagocytose the iron particles, which included dendritic cells among others, were further processed to isolate the dendritic cells.

In the current Office Action, the Examiner points to the 2002 date of Lipscomb, noting that it is a post-filing reference. However, this ignores the fact that Karhumaki was also provided as a reference. Karhumaki describes a rapid and simple technique for purifying dendritic cells based on the fact that dendritic cells do not phagocytose carbonyl iron particles. This clearly indicates that as of 1998 it was well known that uptake by dendritic cells and macrophages differed dramatically—so much so that the difference in uptake was exploited to separate these two types of cells from one another.

Examiner also points to the portion of Lipscomb that states that immature dendritic cells are "avidly endocytic". However, this portion of Lipscomb doesn't indicate whether this endocytic activity corresponds, for instance, to phagocytosis or pinocytosis.

The Examiner further notes that Lipscomb teaches that dendritic cells take up antigens, including whole cells, by phagocytosis, by receptor mediated pinocytosis and by fluid phase pinocytosis. However, this assertion is supported by citation to reference 133, which was published well after the priority date of the present application.

Furthermore, the discussion at page 104 of Lipscomb referred to by the Examiner pertains to endocytosis of peptide-containing antigens. A cell's ability to endocytose peptide antigens, however, is in no way indicative of a cell's ability to take up, transcribe and translate a nucleic acid encoding a polypeptide. In fact, the data in the present specification clearly indicates that cells were able to endocytose naked DNA, but that the naked DNA appears not to

have been released from the endocytic vesicles (see, e.g., Example 1 and page 26 and Figure 2). A more diffuse DNA distribution was indicated for the PLG-CTAB-DNA microparticles. Without wishing to be held to any particular theory, Applicant postulated that the cationic surfactant may have disrupted the endosomal compartment, allowing DNA localization to the nucleus. In any event, the microparticles were found to be a necessary component for peptide expression. See Example 2 in which gene product was only detected in PLG-CTAB-DNA preparations.

Thus, even assuming for the sake of argument that one of skill in the art would have expected immature dendritic cells to endocytose microparticles and DNA, as shown in the specification, neither immature nor mature dendritic cells are able to take up and express naked DNA (as opposed to microparticle-adsorbed DNA). Accordingly, the endocytic pathway is not a predictable route to introduce DNA into dendritic cells.

Finally, with regard to mature vs. immature dendritic cells, Applicant found that that immature cells resulted in IL-2 levels that were 55% greater than background levels whereas mature BMDCs resulted in IL-2 levels 77% greater than background. See page 287. This result is unexpected, to the extent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected mature dendritic cells to be nonphagocytic (indeed nonendocytic) as suggested by Lipscomb.

Song does not overcome the deficiencies in Hedley, because Song employs viral vectors. Viruses have specifically adapted to inject genetic material into cells, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not extrapolate from a virus used to introduce nucleic acids into a cell to a microparticle.

In this regard, it is respectfully pointed out that one of ordinary skill in the art (i.e., a scientist) would be acutely aware of the differences between the working examples of a patent specification (i.e., the experiments actually conducted) and remainder of the specification. In particular, one of ordinary skill in the art would read a patent specification like any other scientific publication. That is, one of ordinary skill in the art would read what experiments were actually conducted by the authors alongside other assertions by the authors regarding what might be potentially achievable and then make his or her own conclusions. Specifically, one of ordinary skill in the art would not simply assume that such other assertions are true, including (a) assertions of utility in other APC's such as dendritic cells, based on experiments with macrophages (see Hedley) or (b) assertions of utility in non-viral gene delivery vehicles, based

on experiments with recombinant retroviruses (see Song). Rather, one of ordinary skill in the art would critically evaluate such statements in view of the experiments in the specification and the rest of the art.

In addition, Hedley describes microparticles with *internal* nucleic acids, rather than microparticles having *adsorbed* antigen-encoding polynucleotide as claimed in claim 54. See, for example, Hedley at col. 1, lines 32-37 ("microparticles *containing* nucleic acids"), *Id.* at col. 9, lines 2-4 ("microparticles can be prepared which carry … DNA … *within* each microparticle"), *Id.* at col. 13, lines 64-66 ("the protein or peptide encoded by the nucleic acid contained *within* the microparticle"), *Id.* at Table 5 ("[p]hagocytosis of *encapsulated* DNA leads to expression of a luciferase reporter gene construct") and Table 6 ("[e]xpression of *encapsulated* luciferase DNA in murine muscles"). (Emphasis added.)

With respect to the distinction between encapsulation vs. adsorption, the Examiner has argued that the claims *encompass* microparticles with encapsulated nucleic acid and points specifically to claims 46 and 50 in which at least a portion of said polynucleotide is entrapped within said microparticles. Office Action mailed September 22, 2004, at page 8. However, the test for obviousness is based on whether or not there is some reason to combine reference teachings and arrive at the claimed invention (e.g., one in which polynucleotide is adsorbed to microparticles), not whether or not the claims might encompass certain features of the prior art (i.e., microparticles with entrapped polynucleotide). In other words Hedley doesn't teach or suggest nucleic acid adsorption, but rather teaches nucleic acid encapsulation. The fact that certain of Applicant's claims further include encapsulated nucleic acid does not remedy this deficiency in Hedley with respect to adsorption.

The Examiner continues to allege that "the interaction of the polynucleotide with the microparticle depends on the charge characteristics of the microparticle itself and the presence or absence of additional molecules such as detergents or surfactants. The microparticles of Hedley are not positively charged, thus combining the microparticles with the polynucleotide results primarily in encapsulation. On the other hand, Fattal clearly teaches that adding a cationic detergent to the biodegradable microparticles results in particles with a positive charge such that the majority of the negatively charged polynucleotide adsorbs onto the cationic surface rather than encapsulating therein." Office Action mailed May 5, 2009 at pages 9-10. With respect to the cationic detergent, the Examiner alleges that Fattal provides motivation for including a

cationic detergent in a microparticle by teaching that inclusion of a cationic detergent in microparticles increases the amount of polynucleotide associated with the polymer particles and increases the uptake of the nucleic acid by phagocytosis/endocytosis. *Id.* at page 10.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The polynucleotide of Hedley is encapsulated due to the double (w/o/w) emulsion particle formation process that is performed in Hedley. See col. 14, lines 22-39. The polynucleotide of Hedley is never "combined with" preexisting microparticles. In a completely non-analogous process, Fattal adsorbs a 15-mer antisense oligonucleotide onto nanoparticles by adding cationic detergent/oligonucelotide ion pairs to a nanoparticle suspension in the presence of NaCl. Fattal at pages 138-139.

Concerning the use of cationic detergent, it is noted that Fattal observes that the poor yield of oligonucleotide association in the absence of CTAB may be explained by the fact that polyalkylcyanoacrylate (PACA) nanoparticles bear negative charges that results in electrostatic repulsion with the polyanionic oligonucleotides (page 139, col. 1), which suggests that similar results would not be obtained with neutral biodegradable polymers such as PLGA.

With regard to the Examiner's statement that including a cationic detergent in a microparticle increases the uptake of the nucleic acid by phagocytosis/endocytosis, Applicant wishes to clarify that uptake was said to be increased because the oligonucleotide was associated with the particles and could be phagocytosed. See Fattal at p. 138. Fattal doesn't teach, however, that particles with associated cationic detergent are phagocytosed to a greater degree than particles without cationic detergent.

Moreover, as noted above, while the cells of Hedley may demonstrate phagocytosis, the same would not have been expected for dendritic cells at the time of the invention. Indeed, dendritic cells can be separated from other cells, including macrophages, based on their lack of phagocyticity.

It is further submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to draw inferences between the teachings of Song, Hedley and Fattal as urged by the Examiner, because these references each describes a different approach to nucleic acid delivery. For example, Song describes viral techniques as well as non-viral techniques including techniques in which polynucleotides are associated with condensing agents or encapsulated in liposomes. Song is silent with respect to microparticles. Hedley describes encapsulation of polynucleotides within microparticles, whereas Fattal teaches adsorption of oligonucleotides onto nanoparticles.

Moreover, Fattal merely reports the internalization of a 15-mer *oligonucleotide* (oligomer) adsorbed onto nanoparticles, and that the oligomer remains intact for several hours after cell uptake. See, e.g., Fattal Abstract and p. 140, col. 2. Clearly, oligonucleotides *per se* do not function in the same manner as polynucleotides, such as those described in Song and Hedley, which encode and express a polypeptide. Thus, the mere fact that a 15-mer oligonucleotide *remains intact* upon internalization would not have lead to a reasonable expectation that full length nucleic acid vectors such as those described in Song and Hedley would be transcribed and translated.

Also, due the notable differences between Hedley and Fattal (e.g., encapsulation vs. adsorption, microparticles vs. nanoparticles, charged PACA polymer vs. uncharged PLGA polymer, antigen-encoding polynucleotide vs. 15-mer oligonucleotide, etc.), it is respectfully submitted that Fattal would not motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to use a cationic detergent like that described in Fattal in conjunction with a microparticle-based transfection agent like that of Hedley, as alleged by the Examiner.

Moreover, Fattal reports no difference in nuclear-fraction oligonucleotide content between oligonucleotide given free or delivered by nanoparticles. Upon reading this, one of ordinary skill in the art upon would have had no motivation whatsoever to go to the trouble of adsorbing plasmid DNA to microparticles, because this effort would not have been expected to enhance delivery of the plasmid DNA to the nucleus (i.e., the location where expression take place) relative to the administration of free DNA.

The Examiner has countered that this is not found persuasive, because the claims do not recited methods of enhancing DNA delivery to the nucleus. Applicant's point, however, goes to the motivation to combine the references. Given that Fattal reports no difference in nuclear-fraction oligonucleotide content between oligonucleotide given free or that delivered by nanoparticles, there would be no reason for one of ordinary skill in the art to adsorb antigen-expressing plasmid DNA like that taught by Hedley to nanoparticles as taught by Fattal, because this effort would not have been expected to enhance delivery of the plasmid DNA to the nucleus (where expression take place). This is true notwithstanding the fact that Applicant does not explicitly claim a method of enhancing DNA delivery to the nucleus.

Nor would there have been a reasonable expectation of success, based on the type of cells that were investigated in Hedely and Fattal. In this regard, Hedley describes administration to

macrophages, whereas Fattal teaches administration to U937 cells (commonly referred to in the art as "monocyte-like" or "macrophage-like" cells). As previously indicated, one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately recognize that particulate uptake by macrophages and macrophage-like cells, which are aggressively phagocytic, would not be predictive of particulate uptake by dendritic cells, which are not.

On the other hand, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found various reasons to *avoid* the use of a cationic detergent. For example, detergents are typically added to stabilize emulsions that are commonly used to prepare microparticles and/or to impart desirable physical properties to the finished microparticle powder preparation, for example, the ability to flow freely. Nonionic detergents, in particular, polyvinyl alcohol are commonly used for this purpose (see, e.g., Example 1 of Hedley). Charged detergents, on the other hand, are less desirable, because they impart undesirable properties such as stickiness to the resulting microparticles. For this reason, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to avoid the use of cationic detergents such as CTAB. The motivation to avoid cationic detergents would have been reinforced by the fact that nonionic detergents, such as polyvinyl alcohol, are generally known to have reduced toxicity as compared to cationic detergents, such as CTAB.

In this regard, "the Examiner must show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and *with no knowledge of the claimed invention*, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed." *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1998). (Emphasis added.) As seen from the above discussion, this would not occur.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, upon considering Song, Hedley and Fattal *as a whole*, would not have been motivated to provide a method like that claimed in claim 54, nor would there have been a reasonable expectation or success, absent the hindsight gained from Applicant's disclosure.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 54 in view of Song, Hedley and Fattal be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-16, 18-23, 29-31, 33-44, 46, 50, 52 and 53

Claims 1-16, 18-23, 29-31, 33-44, 46, 50, 52 and 53 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Song in view of Hedley and Fattal. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, like claim 54 above, is directed to a method of transfecting dendritic cells. The method comprises incubating dendritic cells and a transfection agent that comprises a polynucleotide (which encodes an antigen associated with a virus, a bacterium, a parasite, a fungus or a tumor) adsorbed on surfaces of microparticles. The incubation is performed *ex vivo* for a time sufficient to transfect the dendritic cells with the polynucleotide, thereby leading to the expression of said antigen. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Song, Hedley and Fattal for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 54.

Moreover, claim 1 is directed to a process that, *inter alia*, comprises incubating the dendritic cells with a transfection agent comprising an antigen-encoding polynucleotide adsorbed on surfaces of microparticles, wherein the transfection agent is formed by a process that comprises: (a) providing microparticles that comprise a biodegradable polymer and a cationic detergent, and (b) exposing said microparticles to a polynucleotide.

As previously noted, Song and Hedley are silent concerning polynucleotide adsorption, and they are also silent regarding cationic detergents. In Fattal, on the other hand, a cationic detergent (CTAB) and a 15-mer oligonucleotide are simply added to nanoparticles in suspension. See, e.g., Fattal, p. 138, col. 2. In other words, this process cannot be said to teach or suggest one in which particles that comprise a biodegradable polymer and a cationic detergent are provided and then exposed to a polynucleotide in order to adsorb the polynucleotide to the particles.

The Examiner urges, inter alia, that "[d]ue to the dynamic process of the association of the cationic detergents with the suspended microparticles, at least some portion of the particles taught by Fattal et al. comprises CTAB before they further associate with the polynucleotide." Fattal, however, does not teach or suggest that this is the case. Indeed, Fattal teaches that ion pairs are formed between the negatively charged phosphate groups of the nucleic acid and the hydrophobic cations (i.e., the CTAB). Had at least some portion of the nanoparticles contacted the CTAB before they further associate with the polynucleotide as urged by the Examiner, then ion pairs would have formed *between the negatively charged polyalkylcyanoacrylate particles*

and the positively charged CTAB. The formation of such pairs, however, is neither taught nor suggested by Fattal.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to the presently pending claim 1.

Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-16, 18-23, 29-31, 33-44, 46, 50, 52 and 53 depending therefrom, be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 19-23

Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Song in view of Hedley and Fattal. This rejection is clearly respectfully traversed.

First, claims 19-23 depend from claim 1 and are thus patentable over Song, Hedley and Fattal for the reasons set forth in the prior sections.

Moreover, it is noted that claims 19-23 are directed to a procedure in which dendritic cells are transfected *ex vivo* in accordance with claim 1, and then administered to a vertebrate subject in an amount effective to produce an immune response.

As noted above, Song teaches nothing about microparticles as delivery vehicles and Song expresses a clear preference for direct injection of recombinant retroviruses (see, e.g., Song, page 27, lines 25-27) over the use of *ex vivo* techniques.

As noted above, Hedley does teach that microparticles can be introduced intradermally (i.e., to the APCs of the skin, such as dendritic cells and Langerhans cells). Unlike the claimed method, however, this single mention of dendritic cells in Hedley is in conjunction with an *in vivo* technique. The remainder of Hedley is directed to macrophages, which are fundamentally different from dendritic cells as noted above.

The Examiner has referred to column 12 and Example 2 of Hedley as supporting *ex vivo* techniques. At col. 12, lines 23-30, Hedley refers to "in vitro/ex vivo use." However, that use is clearly experimental, as opposed to therapeutic. Hedley states nothing about administering dendritic cells that have been transfected *ex vivo* to a vertebrate subject. Instead, Hedley merely states that "[t]he [mammalian] cells can be either analyzed immediately or recultured for future analysis.") *Id.* Similarly, while Example 2 of Hedley describes an *in vitro* cell study, this is just a prelude to the *in vivo* cell studies in Examples 3 *et seq.* to follow. An *in vitro* cell study with macrophages is far removed from a procedure in which dendritic cells are transfected *ex vivo* in

accordance with claim 1, and then administered to a vertebrate subject in an amount effective to produce an immune response, as claimed in claims 19-23.

Indeed, from a therapeutic standpoint, Hedley as a whole is clearly directed to *in vivo* treatment techniques. In this regard, Hedley teaches various methods for *in vivo* delivery including (a) direct delivery into the bloodstream (i.e., by intravenous or intraarterial injection or infusion), (b) subcutaneous injection, (c) intradermal delivery, (d) delivery via the gastrointestinal tract and (e) introduction of microparticles into the lungs. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 20-34. See also col. 13, lines 15-20. All in vitro teachings of Hedley are related to experimental, rather than therapeutic procedures.

Fattal, like Hedley, teaches nothing about administering dendritic cells (or any other cells) that have been transfected *ex vivo* to a vertebrate subject.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to presently pending claims 19-23.

Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 19-23 be withdrawn.

Claims 55-59

As indicate in the Office Action, since the method of making microparticles taught by Hedley results in a majority of the nucleic acid entrapped within the microparticles, it would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art to combine the teachings to Song, Hedley and Fattal to produce a microparticle in which polynucleotide encoding an antigen is adsorbed to the microparticle with no polynucleotide present entrapped within the microparticle.

Consequently, claims 55-59 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. This has been achieved by the above amendment. Allowance is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all claims are presently in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner be of the view that an interview would expedite consideration of the application, request is made that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney at (703) 433-0510 in order that any outstanding issues be resolved.

If there are any fees due and owing in respect to this amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge such fees to deposit account number 50-1047.

CORRESPONDENCE

Please direct all correspondence to:

Novartis Vaccines and Diagnostics, Inc. (formerly Chiron Corporation)
Intellectual Property Department X-100B
P.O. Box 8097
Emeryville, CA 94662-8097

Respectfully submitted,

/David B. Bonham/

David B. Bonham
Registration No. 34,297

Attorney for Applicant
Mayer & Williams PC
251 North Avenue West, 2nd Floor
Westfield, NJ 07090
Tel.: 703-433-0510
Fax: 703-433-2362